That Which Endures

A dedication to
Anna Garlin Spencer

WITH the death of Anna Garlin Spencer on February 11, 1930, in her eightieth year, a life devoted to the betterment of family relationships came to an end. But as Mrs. Spencer's belief in the strength of the family grew from her profound understanding of its roots in the past, so also her inspiration will carry on into the future.

The following extracts from her own philosophy of family life cover the last eighteen years. In 1913, already a woman of mature years, she was a pioneer in the frank facing of problems of discord and friction. An article written shortly before her death, but not published until two months later, in May, 1930, still carries in every line the same clear vision and the same faith—that the most permanent satisfactions in human relations are to be found in family life.

The marriage of tomorrow will substitute for ancient tribal and family arrangements, and for the domination of church and synagogue, a State supervision and legal guardianship in marriage which shall curb freedom at the point where it degenerates into selfish whim and hasty passion, and shall fitly represent the interests of society at large in every private union of man and woman. . . .

The marriage of tomorrow will be sure to make the purity and strength of family descent and the well-being of children and the higher interests of society its prevailing ideals. The marriage of tomorrow must, also, through constructive social ingenuity, receive the benefit of economic easements which will more justly divide the cost to one generation of raising the next.

While this is being accomplished, the experience of the ages must be justified in holding sacred that personal choice of selective affection, that unique intimacy and interdependence that have made, still make, and will probably always make, individualized marriage and parenthood the supreme spiritual discipline of the race. *Harper's Weekly, October 4, 1913.*

The pessimism many feel in view of the divorce court records is not shared by the speaker. The fact that it is so easy to get rid of the marriage bond, and the fact that divorce, and remarriage if desired, is now not a cause for social ostracism, make bonds of affection and the sense of mutual consideration and social responsibility, especially toward the children, the only firm and lasting foundations for family permanence and marriage satisfaction.

We have let a changing family condition due to the industrial revolution and the new freedom of women and the new social demands on parents work tragedies through neglect of social aid at a moment of impatience with difficulties and of too great desire to do as one pleases, no matter how it works for others. *From an unpublished speech.*

It is a sure instinct that is now leading in academic and nonacademic fields of heroic efforts to fit the generation now coming of age and now undertaking marriage, homemaking and parenthood, to be the fit and competent link between the past and the future life of the race. It may be that the several commissions on education which Secretary Wilbur has appointed at the suggestion of President Hoover may yet include such leadership in adult education as may give needed guidance to the men and women, younger or older, who must make the race inheritance to which the children of today will fall heir. We cannot save the children unless we save and perfect the home. We cannot make marriage and the family successful unless those in charge of the children as parents and teachers lead the way. Hence the race culture of the child must include the social guidance of the adult. *The Ladies' Home Journal, May, 1930.*

Changing Patterns of Family Living

SIDONIE MATSNER GRUENBERG

THROUGH all the turmoil of economic and social change, what continues to hold the family together? How significant is it for the community and for the individuals who compose it? To what extent does it remain a coherent and dynamic unity?

When we think of the family in terms of economic change we are forced unequivocally to admit that it has lost a very large part of its primary importance in providing food and clothing and even shelter. When we think of it in terms of social contacts we cannot fail to see that it has lost much of its opportunity as a center and meeting place and still more of its power over social usages and conventions. And so *change* in speaking of the family has come to be taken as almost synonymous with *loss*.

Hand in hand with progressive specialization in all things has come the removal from the home of those various activities that in the past swarmed about the task of maintaining the family. The advantages of division of labor, for the consumer as well as for the producer, have accelerated the drift to the city, so that today with some fifty-six per cent of the population in communities of 2500 or more, urbanization is the most conspicuous characteristic of modern life. The typical account of modern living stresses the cafeteria, the nursery school, the breathless rushing about, the congestion, the complicated program of daily comings and goings.

Since millions of our populace are still to be found in the small towns and on the farms, this picture may seem hardly fair. The astute observer may still point to the masses who seem to live according to the old pattern, whose homes, even in metropolitan areas, present nothing to distinguish them externally from the picture of a generation or two ago. But even where the outward appearance of the houses and the back yards may be the same as in the past, where the activities that occupy the hands of their dwellers may be the same, the spirit is different. Even where the material conditions seem least changed the eyes of the young people are turning to the city and city ways. The thinking, the hoping, the striving, all turn toward the pattern set up by the city. Where will the young people in the rural regions and small towns find, even in their reading, anything that popularizes the kind of living that their parents and grandparents experienced?

The home is just one, though perhaps the most vital, of the human institutions which must be transplanted and adapted to urban soil. And with the assumption of city living as the normal and "regular" mode, we are challenged to justify our values and attitudes. All of our arrangements for living come to be on a more conscious level. For our cities have grown up in total disregard of the needs of family life and of children, until today they make almost impossible the fulfillment of normal family needs. As a result there are everywhere in our larger cities evidences of recognition on the part of individuals and organizations, that children, as well as adults, are being deprived of some very essential experiences. Everywhere we see efforts to recapture, by whatever makeshifts, some of the fundamentals of an earlier mode of life.

Sociologists have stressed the economic aspects of these changes in the family; but subjectively perhaps the most significant factor that is making for new patterns of family living is the changed status of woman. It has become a commonplace to recognize these changes piecemeal, but we are just beginning to sense the implications that woman's changed status has brought about.

One factor that has obscured and confused the situation is the availability of various aids for household management. These have minimized the details of operations without decreasing the demands made upon the home, thus seeming to leave the mother in increasing readiness to meet every call that might be made upon her. We have assumed, in our public thinking, that every home has actually at its command all these modern devices and specialized resources for making life more comfortable; and that every mother has, through the shifting of a hundred domestic processes to the factory, actually a proportionate increase in leisure. It is true that the ordinary mother has less of baking and sewing and washing to do, and rarely knows anything about spinning

and weaving. It is true that as a community we have at our disposal trained nurses and dieticians, expert kindergartners and dancing teachers. The fact remains, however, that with all the improvements and specializations and perfections, most women find that their homes still demand both time and skill, albeit these skills are of an entirely different nature from those of other generations.

The successful family still derives from the operation of a mother who is competent to coordinate a multitude of activities and to harmonize a number of individuals, and to guide the latter in a multitude of decisions and predicaments. The old-fashioned mother at her best was a high grade executive and her kind of service is still needed. At the same time it is impossible today to make motherhood a profession. There is thus the need not only of retaining for women the opportunity to render in the home their distinctive services, but also of so adjusting the hours and the management of our public economic and administrative processes as to permit women to take their due share in them.

Burning the Candle at Both Ends

THE removal of traditional legal and conventional inequalities in woman's status is a cultural and spiritual gain. But because the new status has been won only through struggle and confusion, woman is forced to pay an excessive price for its benefits. The feminists have claimed so much for woman's opportunities outside the home, that her home functions have been minimized, if not entirely overlooked. In order to prove a point, they have claimed for women both too much and too little. They have tried to get women to do whatever men do, and then carry their own tasks besides.

Yet child-bearing and child-rearing cannot be considered a minor incident in life, no matter what assistance or relief or expert guidance may be available. Women—and men too—are finding that even after many of the household chores of former days have been eliminated, homemaking remains a considerable task. The subtle legerdemain that is shielded from criticism by the label "existing order" has offered to men and women alike the sound knowledge and marvelously productive skill of a thousand specialists. But we have bought this "expert service" dearly in each individual's personal loss of the common knowledge and the common skills whereby a past culture maintained itself. It is even a question whether we can command the newer wisdom when we really need it most. Thus, the trained nurse of today is vastly more competent in her field than was the ordinary mother of a generation ago; but the ordinary mother of today has neither the admittedly crude equipment of her mother, nor the money to get the trained nurse if and when needed.

One vital factor in this situation is that today there exists less often the "extra" family member who formerly was available in minor emergencies. Those convenient maiden aunts or older sisters or cousins, whose leisure and interest could be freely called upon when someone was needed and mother was not there, have somehow disappeared into the professions now open to women, or are "leading their own lives" in one way or another. We are obliged either to arrange our households on a scale out of all proportion to the occasional need, or else to have recourse to such external aids as the visiting nurse, or visiting housekeeper, whose present availability is infinitesimal as compared to the need.

In the desire to take advantage of modern social and cultural resources, families are experimenting everywhere to meet the basic demands of the family for the mother's time and special services. Various kinds of mother's helper and of mother-substitute are being tried out—the nursery school, the part-time play supervisor and others. In several instances families have joined in a cooperative endeavor to pool their resources of time and services; one mother can look after several children at the same time, and by doing this in rotation several mothers are relieved for work or for leisure pursuits that would otherwise be unattainable.

Although millions of women are still overworked, the problem of woman's use of leisure is a pressing one. The salvaging of earlier training, technical experience or profitable hobbies after the children no longer demand most of the mother's time is one kind of problem. How to keep up with the changing world, and especially with the growing children themselves, is another. The responsibility for solving some of these problems rests theoretically with those women who are virtually free to choose what they will do. We have assumed that it is necessary for women to choose between the home and an outside job as their major concern. It is questionable however whether this is at all necessary. Where the job and the home compete for women's devotion and enthusiasm or where women compete for men's jobs, it is likely that we are all losers.

From confession stories and magazine articles, as well as from personal contacts, we can already envisage the thousands of mothers who have been driven to wish for the good old days by their failure to live satisfactorily two complete lives, by their

having attempted the impossible. Many have felt it necessary to choose between total devotion to a job and total absorption in their children—an impossible choice. We can see also the disillusioned women who have made all the sacrifices, whether through vanity or misapplied ambition, to help their husbands make an enviable place for the family, carrying two full shares of strain and struggle only to find, when the family at last has "arrived," that they are too worn out for either their husbands or their children.

A Question of Values

It has been our observation that women with outside work and a satisfactory married life have considered their jobs secondary to their homes in a subjective and spiritual sense. There is something fundamental in the relation of the mother to her children that permanently and unalterably distinguishes her from the father, aside from any theories or wishes or traditions. The attempt of the mother to carry a full-time job puts upon her a disproportionate burden that should be recognized for what it is. For it is in the nature of family living that woman's outside job is preeminently important to her only at certain periods and within certain limitations. If we consider the family as an essential unit, her's should not be a straight line development depending upon mere continuity for its satisfactions or its promotions.

Another important factor in the changes which modern life has brought into family living is the element of choice. Where in the past there was scarcely any acceptable alternative to the conventional pattern of successful married life, today one of the prerequisites of success is a willingness to admit that there are alternatives to be faced. The young married couple of today is challenged to choose among many ways all of which raise new problems and for which there are available no clear standards. Shall there be children? And if so, when and how many? Should the wife work outside the home if it is not economically necessary? Should she do her own housework, or earn enough outside to hire a substitute? Should she look forward to resuming her activities in any technical field for which she may have been trained? And if she does, what share of the financial responsibility should she expect to carry?

The necessity for choosing between values and needs extends, for example, even to the question of the location of a home. Is it better to live nearer the father's work so that he may have more time at home, or to live where there is more space and air and quiet, though the father must make a long daily trip to his work? One possible location has a better school, but the other is in a "nicer neighborhood." Play space for children may have to be weighed against better use of play time for adults. There is the common question of living in the city or the suburbs, in a large city or a small. Many young professional people are confronted with the problem of living quietly and comfortably in a smaller community or under great strain and anxiety in a larger one; but with the risk of stagnation and intellectual isolation in the one case, as against stimulation and potential growth in the other.

Every choice naurally affects the children as well as the adults. Nevertheless we realize that family living cannot be "for the good of the children" unless it is at the same time for the good of all concerned. People are increasingly realizing that they are entitled, as adults, to benefit from family living. Parents are beginning to understand that their own right to happiness need not be subordinated to an illusory, undefined "family good," and that their gains as individuals will benefit the family no less than their sacrifices—and possibly more.

Furthermore, we are more and more aware that just as no one plan of living can be applied to all families, neither can a single plan be made to suit one family for the whole span of its existence. For the family life itself is contingent upon its own many phases, each of which brings its unique demands and challenges. Our way of living before the children come is based upon one set of values, which must give place to others as new needs as well as new interests arise. Soon the children are no longer babies—they are at school, then at college, away from home. At each point the whole plan of family living is challenged to readjustment; so that there is needed in modern living not a permanent plan but rather a long range philosophy. We have to choose not once but many times.

Pioneers, Present and Future

The implications of all this point toward a sounder education for our young people. It is fairer to the boys as well as to the girls to let them know toward what they must look forward. For everyone is affected by the opportunity to choose what he will do about his life in relation to the other lives that constitute his family, and young people in particular are faced with responsibilities that are literally unprecedented. For girls and women, whose lives in the past have as a rule been lived within tra-

ditionally ordered bounds, the opportunity for choice has come as a somewhat puzzling privilege. In the old days their work, both before and after marriage, was "cut out for them." But now the new freedom means responsibility for making many decisions for which they have as yet no adequate guidance.

Nor can we ever seek for standardization in these matters, since there still must be individual adjustment to meet individual needs and situations. We see around us many young people who are making intelligent and discriminating choices. Many of them are pioneering, and like the pioneers of another day they are meeting difficulties and obstacles, disappointments and failures. But many are succeeding magnificently; and the contribution of all of them is as significant to family living today as was the contribution of the pioneers who opened up new physical frontiers.

These rearrangements of the various social and economic functions have brought into bolder relief the essential meaning of the family as a system of dynamic relationshsips that determine the growth and development of personalities. Even the most objective analysis has shown that the home has something superlative to offer in the care of children. Parents today will have to utilize many agencies; their executive ability will have to extend beyond the walls of the home in a coordinating process. But of one thing we may remain certain—the family in some form or other will endure. Its contributions to the welfare of the community and to the happiness of the individual will depend in large measure upon the thought we are willing to give to its evolving responsibilities and upon the extent to which we are willing to let it share in the material and intellectual gains of past and present.

Solidarity and Loyalty

CECILE PILPEL

"One of the most familiar traits of our time is the tendency to revise tradition, to reconsider the foundations of old beliefs, sometimes mercilessly to destroy what once seemed indispensable."—Josiah Royce: Philosophy of Loyalty.

HUMAN survival and progress are probably synonymous with family solidarity. From patriarchal days up to and probably even into our own time, life for the individual was so insecure economically, socially and emotionally that, to paraphrase Voltaire, family solidarity would have had to be invented, if it had not very naturally evolved. The individual was dependent for protection, sustenance and social life on his family. It was a case of hanging together or hanging separately. Solidarity blossoms most abundantly where individuals are dependent upon one another for physical protection and where there are social discriminations which call out an undivided front for psychological protection. As soon as pressure is removed, solidarity weakens, and we lose both the evil and the good of the attitudes and behavior which solidarity calls out.

Presentday living, it is said, makes "family living" a flexible thing, now here, now there; all the members of the family are scarcely ever at home at the same time—with the children at nursery schools, all-day schools, colleges, clubs. Modern inventions and social changes have increased the individual's range from the narrow confines of home to the whole world. Leisure hours may, because of annihilation of distances, be spent wherever the individual pleasure calls.

It is not surprising that presentday youth should look askance at family solidarity, view it purely as a hang-over from an outworn epoch without much material evidence in its favor, without justification or reason in a modern world.

When family claims become pressing on a purely affectional basis, they retort, "God gives us our relations, but thank God we can choose our friends."

It is wise, therefore, for those of us to whom family solidarity and family loyalty were both an economic necessity and an emotional experience, to pass them in review and discard them, if they no longer serve a purpose. The history of family solid-

arity and loyalty is tainted with glaring examples of greed, autocracy, nepotism; everything that is evil may be found under that banner. When we are in a discarding mood, when we feel our oats, when we are young and living in the Twentieth Century, a little drunk with our mechanical achievements, committed to individualism, complete self-development and self-expression, it is easy to single out from recorded history the corrosive effects of family solidarity and loyalty.

Perennial Abuses

The presentday furnishes examples of pernicious types of so-called solidarity and loyalty. Nepotism still plays a role in quarters high and low, and many an able young man finds himself playing wet-nurse to the incompetent son or nephew of the boss. "For the good of the family" is possibly still a euphemism for the "good of the father," for his greater power economically and emotionally.

Many parents, by way of feeling their own power, still like to foster a closed affectional unit with enormously harmful implications for the individual affected by this monopolization. A member of such a family scarcely develops as an individual at all; he feels safe and contented only in his family group, thinking and feeling what the others think and feel, doing what they do without question. His individuality is stunted by this mistaken solidarity and loyalty. His interests are narrowed by the family's isolation, because there are no outside springs to feed them. His intellectual and moral fiber is softened, because he has become too dependent upon his family's constant support and understanding.

Bearing the Brunt

Such girls often have a difficult time, even in the simplified environment of a college. They feel homesick and insecure for months or even years, although sometimes the break from the family comes in time to save them for themselves and make them feel their own individuality at last. Often, however, even so radical a change as marriage is insufficient to break the complete family attachment. The girl may feel that she is understood only at home and, like a spoiled child, return to it for moral support in the slightest emergency, or else the members of her family may come to dominate the husband also, forcing him to accept their dicta, as though he had married all of them. If he comes from a family in which the same emotional, monopolistic form of solidarity obtains, a conflict of loyalties is likely to ensue which may lead to bitter jealousies and conflicts of the most serious kind.

In addition we still have with us examples of family solidarity based on family traditions in regard to modes of living, social standards, vocational choices—"we have had only professional people in our family for the past five generations; now you know where your choice lies; go and do likewise."

The various forms of snobbishness which family solidarity takes are many; any member, no matter how inferior, is still considered superior to an "outsider." If children in such families dare to interest themselves in persons outside the pale, or to consider issues on their merits rather than on family tradition, they may suffer from a feeling of disloyalty implied by the mores of the family. To this indictment of family loyalty, every reader could no doubt contribute additional examples, all of them equally true, and all of them destructive to the individual subjected to this brand of family solidarity.

This monoptic view of the situation naturally does not give us the whole truth. It is merely a selection which some of us are driven to make because of unhappy experiences which have warped our very being, and because it is easier to throw over an institution like the family than to be discriminate in regard to it.

The Family Web of Life

Family solidarity and loyalty do not spring full-fledged into behavior. They are woven out of myriads of fine threads. The pattern we evolve is dependent somewhat, it is true, on the particular economic-social form of our time but far more upon those things which we value in our living. It will endure because it is founded on basic human instincts in contrast to temporary social conditions. The family has played a role in commerce, industry and in the vocations. Ability supported by family loyalty has made some business houses stand like rocks through economic and social upheavals. Many thousands of families weathered storms through the aid of this loyalty, the stronger members helping to carry the weaker ones through economic, social and emotional crises.

Family solidarity and loyalty must become more individualized, less autocratic if it is to meet the needs of the present age. Literature is full of examples of the revolt of individuals against family domination. For every one of these cases there are hundreds who, because of family tolerance and appreciation, have been saved from the crushing world about them, saved for the very furtherance of the

civilization yet to come. The more highly sensitive individual, too far ahead in the civilizing process, will in a loyal family be enabled to live and make his contribution to society.

Giving and Receiving

TRADITION has handed down the story of Aeneas who carried his old father on his back out of the ruins of Troy. In his case it was concern for the aged which was nurtured in family solidarity. But it is not only to the aged that such loyalty is extended, not only in ancient times that it has made itself felt and honored. Almost all of us, even today, know of cases such as that of a grandmother who, at the time of life when she expected to be able to rest from her own arduous motherhood, has undertaken to bring up several little children left motherless by the death of her daughter, nursing them, as a mother would, not only through whooping cough and chicken pox, but also through all the little entangling complications of daily psychological living together, in order that the family need not be broken up. There are many cases, too, of older brothers and sisters who work and save, and even postpone marriage, in order that the education of the younger members of a family may be assured.

There are, of course, many dangers to the individual who thus gives himself in the name of family loyalty and also to the one who receives. These dangers have already been discussed in relation to the more usual family group. They are not implicit in the foster parent situation as such, they merely indicate the need for better insight and understanding of the individual's need in such situations. Family loyalty may be thought of as a symphonic masterpiece whose intrinsic beauty remains even though it may be obscured by faulty execution.

Intangible Assets

EVEN institutions learn the individual requires much more than mere physical care and protection. Family affection and concern for incapacitated members have set new standards for orphan asylums, training schools, nurseries, so that in many of these a very definite effort is being made to supply the most similar possible substitutes for the "intangibles" of family life. The cottage system in orphan asylums, in which children are grouped in small cottages with a motherly caretaker and sometimes even a father substitute, is an illustration of such an effort, as is also the new emphasis in hospitals and nurseries on the infants' truly vital need for "mothering." Some child caring organizations have put their faith in placing children in foster homes, which, with all their imperfections, have a real and human quality, not found even in the best institutions. Social workers and psychiatrists are coming to realize that even a home which seems very unsatisfactory may be better for the child emotionally than the most standardized substitute.

The family offers as a training field all the varieties of human attributes, good, bad or indifferent. In loyal family living permeated with love and affection deliberately nurtured, we can learn to appreciate individual differences, further the interests and abilities of every member, learn together to meet the vicissitudes of life, appreciate and rejoice in one another's successes, and sympathize with one another's failures. The handicapped, the physically weak or defective, the mentally dull and neurotic are met with a very different attitude in the loyal family from that which the outside world has in store for them. In the loyal family the attitude is one of service and protection.

For many years the individual's survival literally depends upon the family shelter and care. But the care is not merely physical. The child's emotional immaturities are protected. The family is behind him as a solid unit. The child first feels, then comes to know, that the home is "eine feste Burg."

A Lifelong Need

NOR can we as adults dispense with the security family loyalty gives. It tends to unify life, to give it stability. We need this more than ever if we, as individuals, are to keep our balance in a world so rocked as that of today by portentous forces.

Security, cooperation, affection—these are priceless achievements of family solidarity at its best. They contribute vastly to the immediate happiness of the individual; but they do far more than this, for the happier the family relationships have been, the more they radiate into outside contacts.

The brotherhood of man has been preached for thousands of years. We seem still to be thousands of years away from its realization. Those of us who have experienced family life in its fullness will not be surprised or discouraged at the slowness with which we have progressed in the direction of this ideal. We will rather, I think, be inclined, because of these very experiences, to believe firmly that solidarity and loyalty will have to be practiced more abundantly in the family, if we are ever to achieve this larger brotherhood.

In Defense of Parental Love

Love and affection, much criticized by some schools of psychology, have not ceased to be both inescapable and all important in parent-child relationships.

RUTH BRICKNER

ONE of the notable trends of recent psychological thinking is in the direction of resurrecting parental love from the disrepute into which it has fallen. Early in the Twentieth Century the onslaught began in a purely literary way and a little later a misinterpreted Freudianism offered food for the ruin both of our sense of humor and of our sense of values. Recent accusations denounced particularly those parents who, through loving their children too much, made it impossible for them to sever the silver cord of emotional dependence. Today, the tumult and shouting having at last died down, we are in a position to view the carnage with a better balance, and to inquire just what is to be said for both the assailant and the assailed.

Our presentation for and against parental love would be a mere listing of opposing arguments, were we not to make an inquiry into its sources in our physiological and emotional being. It is rather widely known that, in many of their cases, students of psychoanalysis have traced the devious routes taken by the instinctive love force in its ceaseless efforts for release. Certain cases were noted where, as children, the patients had been warped in their emotional lives. Only rarely was this due to some catastrophic emotional experience, but often to strong but slowly developing emotional ties, usually to one parent. Some children appeared peculiarly susceptible to this sort of bond, but it was also disclosed that the children were serving as compensations for frustrations in their parents' lives.

This particular psychodynamic mechanism is well recognized in many individual cases. But some now profess to see it behind practically all parental demonstrations of affection. Perhaps the most widely read suggestions for the management of parental love on the basis of this premise are those which Dr. John B. Watson gives in his *Psychological Care of Infant and Child:*

"The mother coddles the child for two reasons. One, she admits, the other, she doesn't admit because she doesn't know that it is true. The one she admits is that she wants the child to be happy, she wants it to be surrounded by love in order that it may grow up to be a kindly goodnatured child. The other is that her own whole being cries out for the expression of love. Her mother before her has trained her to give and receive love. She is starved for love—affection, as she prefers to call it. It is at bottom a sex-seeking response in her, else she would never kiss the child on the lips. . . .

"Let your behavior always be objective and kindly firm. Never hug and kiss them, never let them sit in your laps. If you must, kiss them once on the forehead when they say good-night. Shake hands with them in the morning."

There are many modern parents who, recognizing a modicum of truth in Dr. Watson's outburst, have been shocked at the realization that they might be exploiting the emotions of their children. Others have found justification by virtue of this authoritative pronouncement for a real emotional neglect of their children on the grounds that they must not make them dependent.

Where does the truth lie? What are the origins of parental love and its manifestations, abnormal and, above all, normal? What expressions of it really serve the needs of both child and parent?

Here there is room only to open the discussion. And what is more, we cannot even do this without making artificial distinctions; for only so can the origin of parental love be separated from that of love itself. Love has a wide diversity of objects in which it holds deep interest—love of self, love of mate, love of children and family, love of friends, love of country, love of ideals—these are perhaps the paramount ones.

We must first seek an explanation for the protective, nurturing attitude towards offspring characteristic of so many living things. The significance of this is, of course, primary since it allows for the continuation of the species. Our knowledge of the

emotional overtones associated with the care of the young in lower animals is meager compared with our observations of their biologically well ordered parental activity; and consequently we tend to account for parental love in human beings almost entirely in terms of conscious emotional attitudes. We say we delight in the children for the aesthetic pleasure they give us, because of their naiveté, and any number of other reasons. We disregard the more fundamental protective reaction. The absolute necessity of protection and nurture in the rearing of offspring makes it imperative that the pleasurable values for the parents in this activity offset the painful ones. It must not be overlooked that much of the generation of this pleasurable feeling remains unconscious to the parent. And so, when forced to account for it, he presents reasons which fail to satisfy either the misanthropic bachelor or the searcher after abstract truth. It would appear that these pleasurable feelings are derived in many ways and may be simple or highly complex in their construction. In their simplest form they may be directly sensory, and at the other extreme they may be found in the delights which a parent feels on seeing his child fulfilled individually and socially.

Mother Love and Father Love

WHATEVER the achievement of the parents with regard to the love they hold for their children, the mother and father are likely to arrive at it very differently. The mother's early relationship with her child, characterized as it is by a close physiological bond, of necessity produces feelings more markedly subjective and therefore more intense. The father, free from the emotional entanglements connected with physical maternity, can offer a love that is more detached, and therefore often more serene and uniform in its manifestations. Each gives the child emotional sustenance, and each tends to offset the possible extremes to which the other may go.

On the purely sensory level the mother receives pleasurable stimulation which comes to her from her very close contact with the baby. But this is largely denied the father. The smoothness of the baby's satiny skin is to her one source of such sensation. To many mothers the stimulation of the nipples through nursing may be pleasurable, though this may be difficult for those to comprehend for whom nursing is a source of acute discomfort because of local or emotional irritation.

It may be well once more to stress the fact that the nursing mother whose infant lies at her side is not conscious of, or at the time interested in, the component parts of the tender feeling she holds for her baby. It is, however, this very complex of emotions that we are analyzing. We are separating out the various strands which when woven together form its substance.

Misunderstandings as to the significance of these sensory stimuli for the mother have been current. It has been said, particularly with regard to the pleasant sensations produced in nursing, that they are of importance in the sexual life of the mother. In the same category of current confusions is the idea that thumbsucking is a form of masturbation.

Fallacies of Deduction

THE truth is that complex sensations are produced by combining the functions of a few primary sense organs. The fact that bricks are used as building blocks in the construction of a municipal center as well as in a one-car garage does not warrant us in reducing the architectural significance of the one to that of the other. Just so mothers need not be shocked by the realization that the sensory stimulation which they may recognize as pleasurable in their relations with their children draws upon the same physiological potentialities which may under certain circumstances participate in adult sexual sensation.

The feeling of fulfillment which frequently comes to the mother after childbirth has yet to be fully understood. The fact that the experience is of profound biological significance for her, that she has functioned fully in an organic sense as a result of her motherhood must have an important bearing in the development of the feeling. Out of its clinical experience psychoanalysis presents a discovery which, while it may hold only for certain instances, nevertheless illumines for these this sense of fulfillment. It refers particularly to the love of the mother for a son and suggests that in the course of her acceptance of her feminine role the woman has gone through a period of rebellion (no longer so apparent after adolescence) because she has not had the advantages of masculinity. To that woman the fact that she has borne a male child compensates her for her own lack of maleness and makes her reconciliation to femininity complete. There is then a resolution of the unconscious conflict which has been hitherto operating. The infant who is the immediate reason for that sense of fulfillment becomes the beneficiary of the mother's gratitude and love.

There are other roots of parental delight in the child which may pierce as deeply into the father's

emotions as into those of the mother. A large part of the pleasurable feeling comes from the fact that the child provides the parent with a new piece of self, as it were, on to which the parent ego can expand. The egotistical parent will accept, as though it were for himself, the recognition accorded to his child. When receiving congratulations for some achievements of his child's such a parent more or less consciously says to himself, "Why not? Look at his father." Thus he effectively minimizes the child's prestige and adds to his own all that had really been the child's. On the other hand to the emotionally full-grown parent, the ego satisfaction lies in being able so to relate himself to his children that he may give them both the security and the freedom to grow in their own individual ways. For him is the joy of the "participant observer" who helps to form the environment through which the child realizes his greatest growth possibilities. In this role the parent participates in releasing the creative forces in the child and reaps the joys which come from following closely and sympathetically another individual on his unique way through life.

As part of the process of achieving this role, the parents will learn to recognize and deal with parental attitudes that are incompatible with the ideal. For example a mother who is dissatisfied with her own fund of vitality will take joy in the dynamic energy which her child may show, will "love him for it." For through him this lack of hers has been somewhat mitigated. Such a mother may tend to exploit this vigorous quality in her child. She may "show him off" or overtax his strength, without realizing what she is doing, in order to give herself continuous proof that her long-entertained wish has come true. It is frequently possible for the parent to recognize the reason for such feelings. Although he may not be able to modify the feelings, he can refrain from exerting pressure on the child while under their influence. But if such a mother had been so frustrated that she continues constantly seeking compensation, she would be unable to give her children a love which would be of value to them. She would be unable to supply either the security or the freedom which children need for their best growth. Where children grow up under such blighted emotional atmospheres they in turn become the unwholesome parents of tomorrow. Dr. Crichton-Miller in *Marriage, Freedom and Education* refers to this mutual influence as the "vicious circle of filial and parental reciprocity." He continues:

"Despotic parents turn out children that are either cowed or rebellious but never free. Neurotic parents turn out children that are apprehensive or sensation-mongers, and again not free. Eclipsing parents turn out competitive or diffident children—and they are never free."

We cannot discuss here all the neurotic mechanisms which may give their special color to parental love. But of first importance in its destructive influence on the child's emotional development is the denial of parental love. This is rarely done with full consciousness. The child may have become the victim of the resentment of a parent who is unaware of the source of his own feelings. He may only know that he feels vindictive and has a desire to punish someone for wrongs he vaguely feels have been done him and the child suffers in consequence. Possibly equally destructive is the love which engulfs the child so that he becomes the sole outlet for adult emotions which should normally have many outlets. Sometimes (though rarely) as a result of circumstances, more often as a result of some unhealthy emotional growth, such parents shrink from the life about them, from the responsibilities arising from full emotional experience such as marriage, work, community life and so on. They are in consequence deprived of normal adult satisfactions and attempt through concentrating their love on their children to make up for this multiple lack.

Uncritical Criticism

It is only to these that certain psychologists, of whom Dr. Watson is the most generally known, refer when they denounce "coddling" the child. It is true that one finds instances of neurotic mothers who seek satisfaction from their children in these ways. But it is an empty warning to them to point to the evils of "coddling"; for avoidance of caresses will not make neurotic parents into healthy ones. Nor will a properly timed and placed pat on the head be a substitute for a nourishing parental love.

Floyd Dell in his book *Love in the Machine Age* defends parental love against the uncritical attacks of Dr. Watson. "Psychically healthy parents will be able to give their children the reassurance of love and petting, which they do need, in spite of Dr. Watson, without harming them. For they will be loving the child as a child and not as a substitute-lover." Nor, one may add, as a substitute for anything else. At its best, parental love is not compensatory. It does not seek to gratify itself at the expense of the child's best development. Floyd Dell goes on:

"Not only are Dr. Watson's rules irrelevant to child training in a home where the parents are psychically healthy and adult in their love-lives, but

they are all too likely to be useless to neurotic parents. Children can be emotionally exploited by neurotic parents in the name, not only of Religion, of Duty, of Morality, and of Love, but—not with equal ease perhaps, but with the marvelous ingenuity of which the unconscious mind is capable in the name of Science, of Freedom, of Freud and of Dr. Watson."

Viewed from the Parents' Side

Parents often find that the best way to do "what is good for the children" is to find satisfaction for themselves as well.

MARION M. MILLER

A DECADE or so ago the great majority of books on child study still referred every possible circumstance in the child's life to the child himself. We discussed art, music, discipline, play—always "in the life of the child."

This was not really a departure for we had already become familiar with such expressions as *the century of the child* and *child study* and *the emancipation of children.* This trend tells its own story of change, of struggle up and away from oppression and suppression.

From the time when "children should be seen but not heard," we veered to a time when in all too many homes only the children were seen and heard, to the discomfort of the parents and the dismay of other adults, without any corresponding benefit to the children. The inevitable reaction has, fortunately, not led back to the former state of affairs, in which the autocratic or querulous parent ruled over the home and the majority of children became either diplomatic conformists or rebels. There are many hints that today the family group, small and restricted, to be sure, in contrast with the larger patriarchal family of other days, but the group nevertheless, makes family decisions. Many reasons have been partially responsible for this—among them are probably the growing importance of woman's place in the social and economic scheme, the declining birth rate which makes each family member so much more precious, the increasing tendency to think in terms of group or community in industry and politics, as well as in social and personal relationships.

In every group there is a dominant and subordinate voice. Whose voice then "carries the tune" in the family? Families differ, as individuals differ, and general rules hardly apply. Yet, if one were to posit an ideal modern family, the likelihood is that its tempo would be that of its young adults. Whether they live under one roof, as they would have done in olden days, or whether they have separate establishments, a family group still normally comprises three generations. If then, the family is considered to include at any one time grandparents, parents and children, leaving aside for the moment collateral branches and more remote "cousins and aunts," the parents would normally set the pace of family life. This means on the one hand that grandparents, even if they are still active in their other relationships, must yield to the next younger generation in this regard.

In the professions, in the business world and in social life, advancing maturity may be an asset rather than a handicap. In the family, however, it is essential that the older generation of adults, even if they are still in full strength of their powers, must gradually relinquish the closer bonds of the parent-child relationship. Grown sons and daughters are still children to their own parents, but if they are to attain a satisfactory family life in relation to their own children, the responsibility of ruling their own lives must be theirs. A young mother whose every action and thought are guided by what her mother thinks best and wisest is bound to be ineffective in dealing with her own baby. This means that approximately one generation of power is the normal span in a family. Naturally, it is very difficult for parents, who at forty-five or fifty are still young and active, to step aside and hand the reins of office over to their children whose inexperience and whose diversified interests frequently make them inexpert or even unwilling to

assume the leadership that is rightfully theirs. And so the art of grandmotherhood is one which requires intelligence, tact and understanding. Many women find in its development and practice some of their major satisfactions. This is especially true of those who can see most clearly the essential but subtle differences between their attitude as parent and their attitude as parent once removed.

As a necessary preparation for this transition men and women alike need interests and occupations apart from those essential to the running of the household and the caring of the family.

It is inevitable that as households are organized today the chief occupation of the great majority of wives and mothers must be the daily care of home and children, at least throughout the first dozen or so years of married life. However, even this period, endless as it may seem to some while they are in the thick of it, does not last forever nor need it be so intensive as to leave no time whatever for the development of cultural interests and avocations. Fortunately, the training of young girls today is such that an increasing number develop an interest apart from the rearing of the family, even though they may not make an actual start in the pursuit of a profession before their marriage. The wise young matron will make every effort to retain at least enough of her outside interests so that the foundation is laid for later years when the care of home and children becomes progressively less time-consuming.

Adding Variety to Family Life

It is recognized today that the mental health of an individual is best maintained through some interest. We are just beginning to recognize the fact that the mental health of a family depends upon the interests of its component members. The interests of the various family members need not necessarily be identical; in many cases diversified interests, combined of course with a common sympathy and understanding, make for more colorful family life.

Up to the present generation relatively few women, except under the stress of necessity or the tyranny of a great talent, dared to develop absorbing interests which were not primarily concerned with the home. Consequently these women were left badly stranded as they approached middle age and their main occupation was removed or at any rate greatly curtailed. In greater and greater numbers at the present time, however, we find intelligent young parents who, looking ahead to the time when their children will no longer need their constant attention, are endeavoring to "keep their hand in" so that the years of apprenticeship will have been served in the more plastic years, and the pursuit of their special interest will be devoid of drudgery at a time when they are no longer as patient of drudgery as youth is.

Quite apart from the fact that the development of extra family interests is beneficial to the person who develops them, the family as a whole can only gain from this dispersal of too intensive concern which might otherwise be lavished upon it. Fortunately, many women find in the household and in the close family circle, their greatest satisfaction, and in ministering to the family needs, their greatest joy.

Nevertheless, in many instances, the mother who lives only for her family is in danger of suffocating the family, by her constant watchfulness over the lives of its members. Instances can be multiplied endlessly of sons and daughters, and husbands too, who have been mothered almost to extinction largely because the mother had never found it possible to create a life for herself and found it necessary for her own survival to live completely in the lives of her family. Even very small children—long before they go to school—need ever-lengthening leading strings. One of the most hopeful signs of presentday training of little children lies in the early development of independence of thought and of action. It is not always the mother who is guilty of too possessive an attitude toward her own. Mr. Barrett of Wimpole Street is typical of an autocratic attitude which in some degree exists in many families and which can be as devastating as the less obtrusive but no less tyrannical attitude of the overcautious mother.

Early training for freedom, which is the keynote of progressive education of the present time, plus the lightning rod of an avocation may be the greatest protection of the next generation of children. In making a plea for the loosening of the enslaving bond which has bound families together, we wish in no way to minimize the importance and satisfying nature of the family feeling. Honest affection, respect and community of interest are the forces which cement families together. If this affection becomes a matter of struggle the whole structure is likely to lose its stability and to totter if it does not actually fall to pieces.

In its finest form family affection is assured and inevitable regardless of either prejudice or merit. In our homes we have the right to be loved whether we deserve it or not. Overt emotions cannot jeop-

ardize this love nor should it suffer because of the ambitions, fears or personality quirks of any of its component members. It is true, of course, that many of the potent forces which attract and repel human beings, whether of the same family or not, operate in large measure subconsciously. It is possible, however, to imbue children with respect for individual personalities so that, as they grow older, they will be aware of subtle forces which interact between human beings in such a way that they will not fall into the gross errors which have so frequently marred the relationships of family members. The more we can learn to accept other people as they are, and to appreciate their unique qualities, the more we can refrain from trying to mold them into a pattern of our own fashioning—the more wholesome will be our contacts with them, and the maturer theirs with us.

Family Friction

Conflicts of personality may be constructive as well as destructive, depending on how they are faced.

ZILPHA CARRUTHERS FRANKLIN

THERE was a lurid fascination about the way the Smith children quarreled. To me—an only child, and one brought up in a home where the raised voice and the irritated look were seldom heard—an afternoon with these neighbors was always a revelation. At home the oldest Smith boy, who was also the school terror, was by turns dictatorial and contradictory. He simply couldn't let the other children have their own way without an argument or worse. And so on down to the youngest girl and up to papa and mamma, each of the Smiths made his or her own contribution to the grand family fight, which, like a newspaper serial, was daily "continued in our next."

Renewing their acquaintance years later, I was compelled to my own amazement to re-evaluate the Smiths. They did not really hate each other; they never had. They were actually as devoted a family group as one could find; and as grown-ups they had not only learned how to get along with other people, but had become individuals of real social charm and tact.

How was I to account for this "happy ever after" result of such a tempestuous childhood as that of the Smiths? Though I had been taught to think of all conflict as at best "not nice" and at worst positively destructive, I was forced to conclude that this blanket indictment was too sweeping.

The search for an answer which would be more illuminating in charting a course for my own family brought, at the very outset, the startling discovery that friction differs not only in *amount* but also in *kind*. Family friction is not just a question of more or less, but far more significantly a question of the positive and creative impact of personality on personality as against negative nagging and petty quarreling. Many causes, some of them at least plain enough to the psychologist, must have contributed to the particular variety of combativeness indulged in by the Smiths. There is every reason to believe that there was much to commend it as the interplay of strong individualities learning their own powers and limitations through "meeting up" with their peers. But not all of us are temperamentally fitted to participate in such domestic melodramas. What is much commoner is the everyday pettiness of bickering, quarreling, nagging or even of silence more eloquent of disagreement than words. These are experiences which come to us all, a fact which is all the more reason for admitting frankly to ourselves that they are corrosive. But even corrosives may be made less harmful or even positively beneficial if they are understood for what they are. There are many pointers for one's own family both in the experiences of other parents and the findings of psychologists.

The first suggestion is that, like all behavior, "rubbing each other the wrong way" is a symptom. And just as there are many physical illnesses which produce as one of their symptoms a fever, so also many varieties of psychological and emotional conflicts produce friction. These may range all the way from the deepest hid and subtlest of antipathies to trivial and passing rivalries.

Wise guidance presupposes some understanding of the causes which produce symptoms. One of the earliest and most common causes of family friction

(*Continued on page* 60)

In This Critical Year
The Child Study Association Asks Your Help—

IN FOUR AND ONE HALF decades the Child Study Association has served the American family, working ceaselessly for the betterment of parent-child relationships and the prevention of maladjustment and delinquency.

To the value of its contribution Professor William Heard Kilpatrick, one of those best qualified both because of his educational outlook and because of his opportunities for first-hand observation, bears evidence in the following terms:

"The Child Study Association is, in my clear judgment, the best organization we have to help parents take adequate all-round care of their children. One hardly knows which to admire most: its zeal for work, its sensitivity to the new and good, its breadth of view, or the sanity of its general position. To have all these and to combine them into such actual success is indeed an achievement. I am glad to commend the Association very cordially to the support of all."

The opinions of others similarly qualified are cited opposite.

As a reader of CHILD STUDY you are the recipient of the fruits of the Association's manifold activities, for it is from those activities and through them that CHILD STUDY is made possible and from them and through them that it derives its character.

This year the Association faces a crisis. To carry on it must secure at least fifty-five thousand dollars from sources outside a comparatively small group within the City of New York, from which the major portion of its financial support has been and still is derived.

You, the reader of CHILD STUDY, are peculiarly fitted to judge of the importance of our work and of the need for its continuance.

A comparatively small contribution from each reader of the magazine would furnish the funds required to enable us to weather the storm. Not all can contribute much. Everyone, we believe, can contribute something. $5.00 each would carry us over the top. Every dollar counts.

We are serving you. Will you help us?

CRITICAL IMPRESSIONS

"As to the general soundness and effectiveness of the Child Study Association, everything that I have been able to find out leads me to have confidence in it. . . . In the end the impression remains that here is a remarkable organization for parent education, strategically located for valuable work, combining in unique fashion the volunteer motive of forty years ago with the scientific technique of today, and apparently possessing the rare ability to change with changing needs. I have never seen such an 'old' organization with such a 'new' point of view. . .

"The philosophy and method of the Child Study Association are important not merely for parent education but for the whole field. In meeting the needs of the learners, in insisting upon self-activity in learning rather than upon imposed instruction, in individualizing the material at hand, in recognizing the significance of the emotions, in stressing richness in culture, scientific preparation and resourcefulness on the part of those who are guiding the enterprise—in all these the Child Study Association represents a modern approach that is fundamentally important for education everywhere.

"If the principles and policies now controlling the work of this Association were applied at all levels in the work of education through the United States there would be more likelihood of displacing the present static curriculum, narrow content and routine procedures in American schools and colleges, and we should have a much more hopeful educational situation than we now have."

W. Carson Ryan, Jr.
Director of Education,
U. S. Dept. of Interior,
Office of Indian Affairs

"Parental education is vitally needed to combat the problems of juvenile delinquency and neglect which are so largely the results of home maladjustment and of parental infirmities. The Child Study Association is making a valuable contribution in this direction and it certainly deserves the support of the community in its efforts, not only towards reducing delinquency but also towards eradicating the causes which handicap the lives of so many of our children."

Franklin Chase Hoyt
Presiding Justice of the Children's
Court of the City of New York

"The Child Study Association of America has been the foremost pioneer in the field of parent education and is deserving of respect and wholehearted support. The Association has been responsible for significant developments in many parts of the United States and Canada."

C. M. Hincks, M.D.
General Director, National
Committee for Mental Hygiene

"The Child Study Association has developed a finer vision and a better technique and approach than any organization I know of. I think it not only a duty but also a rare privilege to be able to participate in its various activities. I should like to see it even more widely extended throughout the country."

Bernard Glueck, M.D.
Physician and Psychiatrist,
New York City

Tear off and mail with your contribution.

CHILD STUDY ASSOCIATION
OF AMERICA
221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.

Enclosed is my contribution to the Child Study Association of America.

Name.....

Address .....

.....

Book Reviews

The Family in Literature

ANNA W. M. WOLF

SOMEWHERE toward the end of the Nineteenth Century certain "advanced" literary circles discovered suddenly that the hitherto sacred institution of the family had become a violent storm center. Possibly the general shaking up of social institutions which followed in the wake of the mechanical and intellectual discoveries of the generation just preceding can be held responsible; but the immediate onslaught was led by Ibsen. In his wake the whole concept of "the sanctity of the home" heretofore taken for granted was furiously attacked on every side. The storm then started has been raging in print ever since, and today, despite certain shifts in the prevailing winds, it shows no signs of abating.

Ibsen's *A Doll's House* dared to hint that a virtuous wife may nevertheless be an inadequate mother and that for their development women may need experience and responsibility even at the price of virtue. *Ghosts* exposed to a horrified public the futilities of "mother love" and of self-sacrifice when undirected by wisdom and knowledge. Bernard Shaw presently took up the cudgels against the "girl's prison and the woman's work-house" and, in nearly every play and preface he wrote, he denounced "those enlarged rabbit hutches which we call homes," armed rebellious young people with such phrases as "the enervating atmosphere of love and kindness," and delighted in descriptions of women who were "such good wives and mothers that all their children left home."

This sudden outburst, so shocking at the time, so familiar to the intellectually mature today as to make rereading almost tedious, was followed, largely through Shaw's influence, by the reappearance in 1903 of Samuel Butler's *Way of All Flesh.* This extraordinary novel, one of the great books of all time, had appeared forty years before, but having fallen on barren soil was forced to await a posthumous revival. It is a furious attack upon home and parents—one of the most brilliant, one of the most bitter, one of the most unjust (if we mean by just, a sane and tempered view of the whole truth) and one of the most useful pieces of literary art that the world has seen. Outrages and absurdities have been committed in its name, but it stirred us to our depths and forced the thoroughgoing reevaluation of family life which is still going on. Nothing comparable to it for insight into the spiritual atrocities which members of the same family may commit upon each other has since appeared.

At the same time that literature was serving the ends of criticism on the social side, Freudian psychology in its study of the neuroses was drawing its own conclusions. But this important point of view was much later in taking shape within the covers of popular books. It was not until 1921 that J. C. Flügel in *The Psycho-Analytic Study of the Family* summarized this point of view in a scholarly analysis of the causes and consequences of loving one's children not wisely but too well. Although many less competent literary interpreters have since succumbed to the fad of denouncing the home and shouting indiscriminately for the emancipation of youth, the Freudian contribution, carefully considered, points quite as definitely to the need for parental attachment in the development of the child, as it does to the evil consequences of its exaggerated forms.

Meantime another trend had been mingling with the literary and scientific streams of criticism. This was the "woman movement" which was responsible for another shift in the emphasis on the family as an institution. Realization of the importance of interaction—of parents and children, and children and children—came with the awakened self-awareness in the thinking of women themselves. Olive Schreiner, Ellen Key, Charlotte Perkins Gilman and others became the protagonists of "woman's rights," economic, political and sexual, giving women a place under the sun which was destined profoundly to alter the structure of the home.

Havelock Ellis, beginning in 1899, brought forth in seven volumes his *Studies in the Psychology of Sex,* a work of great importance which proved to be the progenitor of a whole line of literary descend-

ants. These latter have doubtless done us more good than harm, but they are now so numerous that most can be ignored. Both the "woman question" and the "sex question" became so urgent, and the press dumped such carloads of stuff on a bewildered public that the family as a whole bade fair to be lost in the shuffle. Indeed literature ever since has shown this tendency and the sex question continually threatens to engulf the more inclusive one of the family. The literature of the family is, at least in some quarters, increasingly concerned with the total situation. And family life, despite its very salutary chastening, is again conceived as a drama to be played nobly as well as ignobly, albeit set on a new stage and requiring fresh interpretations.

In contrast to the groping and uncertainty of popular writing, anthropological science has been steadily working toward a more positive understanding of the meaning of the family. Westermarck's *History of Human Marriage* (the first of its many editions appeared in Finland in 1889 and in England in 1891) was among the earlier contributions to a more objective treatment. The very nature of the anthropological view tends to conteract an overheated and frenzied approach. The knowledge that tribes and societies have handled their sexual relations in an almost infinite variety of ways, that the value which they set on virginity in a bride, for example, differs diametrically from tribe to tribe, leads us to doubt that human nature is always human nature as we know it after all. In addition, Malinowski, Briffault, Margaret Mead and many others have added to our realization of the enormous mutability of the family in differing epochs and circumstances. At the same time Westermarck's researches have yielded much data in support of his view that promiscuity in the sense of an absence of all sexual restrictions and family responsibility has never existed as an acceptable social mode in any time or clime, and this view has been an important link in the chain of subsequent thinking.

Deeper than Laws

"If the main thesis of this work is correct," he says in defending divorce from those who regard it as a threat to the family, "if marriage is not an artificial creation but an institution based on deep-rooted sentiments, conjugal and parental, it will last as long as these sentiments last. And should they ever cease to exist, no laws in the world could save marriage from destruction." (*A Short History of Marriage,* Macmillan, 1926.)

Middletown, an important contribution to the literature of the family by Robert S. and Helen Merrell Lynd, carries the anthropological method into contemporary society, describing itself as "a pioneer attempt to deal with a sample American community after the manner of social anthropology." There is here assembled an unusually revealing array of facts concerning how men earn livings, their use of leisure, their religious practices, what they think about international relations, birth control, movies, Dorothy Dix and the myriad matters which constitute family interests in a middle-west town of 30,000 inhabitants.

In the Light of Statistics

Another attempt to call in statistics for the better understanding of the family, a work undertaken in the belief that more information is needed before the family can achieve a tolerably happy status, has been made in G. V. Hamilton's *A Research in Marriage.* Here the answers of one hundred married men and married women to nearly four hundred questions concerning their sexual practices and other problems relating to the home are tabulated and correlated with results which, no matter what our criticisms of the particular methods employed, cannot be ignored. We learn that out of one hundred married men, fifty-one expressed themselves as "satisfied with their marriages, forty-nine as dissatisfied; forty-five women were satisfied, and fifty-five dissatisfied." There is much of interest in his data, not only concerning the relative frequency of adultery in men and women, but also concerning the virginity of each sex at the time of marriage. As a criticism in *The Nation* pointed out:

"(1) Almost a third of all the men and a third of all the women had had sexual relations with their spouses before marriage, and fourteen of the women had had similar relations with other men besides; (2) one-fourth of the women and a slightly larger percentage of the men had committed adultery after marriage; and (3) twenty-one of the women had had abortions. On the other hand, since forty-six of the men were virgins at marriage and only thirty-five of the women were not, the authors seem justified in remarking that it looks on the surface as if the hundred men had been rather more chaste than the masculine tradition demands, and the hundred women a good deal less virtuous than women are commonly supposed to be!"

At about this same time Judge Ben B. Lindsey's advocacy of a new legal and social status for changing family conditions as stated in his book on *Companionate Marriage,* was causing widespread interest.

"Companionate Marriage," Lindsey explains else-

where, "proposes to legalize, stabilize, and direct certain of the customs, privileges and practices of modern marriage; practices which are already in widespread use, but which have no legal status or direction." It stands for birth control, divorce by mutual consent where there are no children, and state education of youth and married couples in the art of love, the laws of sex and life, to equip them better for the serious duties of marriage and parenthood.

Formulating New Ethical Codes

Bertrand Russell in *Education and the Good Life* is directly concerned with the children as the central point in the home. At the same time he looks toward and advocates a general loosening of the sex bonds which now, in theory at least, bind the parents.

"When once there are children," he says later in a letter to Judge Lindsey, "I think that divorce should be avoided except for very grave cause. I should not regard physical infidelity as a very grave cause and should teach people that it is to be expected and tolerated, but should not involve the begetting of illegitimate children—not because illegitimacy is bad in itself, but because a home with two parents is best for children. I do not feel that the main thing in marriage is the feeling of the parents for each other; the main thing is cooperation in rearing children."

To which Walter Lippman in *A Preface to Morals* replies acutely:

"If you idealize this logic of birth control, make parenthood a separate vocation, isolate love from work and the hard realities of living, and say that it must be spontaneous and carefree, what have you done? You have separated it from all the important activities which it might stimulate and liberate. You have made love spontaneous but empty, and you have made home-building and parenthood efficient, responsible and dull."

In Defence of Older Ideals

Voices crying in the wilderness are the few articulate expressions in favor of the old order and the old ideals. Dr. Felix Adler, as early as 1905 discerning the drift of the times, made his case in *Marriage and Divorce* for the indissolubility of the marriage bonds. More recently, F. W. Foerster in *Marriage and the Sex Problem* offers us for reconsideration the century-old attitude of Christianity. *Sex Education and Training in Chastity* by Rev. Felix M. Kirsch is a formulation, published in 1931, of the Catholic point of view. One of the difficulties we found with these two more recent contributions is their authors' unwillingness to recognize any consciousness of spiritual values outside the realms of religious orthodoxy. Nevertheless, though we have called them voices crying in the wilderness, we must remember that it is the wilderness of intellectual opinion only. The Pope's recent encyclical on marriage has gone forth with the finality of a command to millions of men and women.

It has seemed as though a thoroughgoing pessimism has seized the souls of the intellectual world, and that the church is not far wrong in its contention that science is powerless to restore love's lost beauty. The novel too has its spokesmen of despair, and Aldous Huxley, Ernest Hemingway and James Joyce give voice to a state of affairs into which such critical essayists as Joseph Wood Krutch penetrate only to find a "generally devaluated world."

A Unifying Force

It is only where one turns definitely to the total family as a center of interest, rather than lingering longer with the sex problem as such that any note of hope is sounded. Possibly this trend in literature will have its counterpart in the hearts of men. The linking of love with family living, with children, with joint enterprise, with companionship, partnership, loyalty and understanding may once more after its ordeal by fire offer us a chance to restore meaning to life. It is no accident that Sigrid Undset, the author of *Kristin Lavransdatter,* has woven the rich fabric of her epic upon the web of family life and that our greatest contemporary novel should be a drama of family relationships.

Along with books whose very titles indicate their mood—*The Bankruptcy of Marriage, Family Disorganization, What Is Wrong with Marriage*—there now appear such comprehensive works as Goodsell's *Problems of the Family,* Popenoe's *The Conservation of the Family* and many others. These books recognize the present chaos, but predict its ultimate solution. Others too see hope in a future where, as Edward Sapir points out in an article in *The American Mercury* for April, 1929:

"That new institutions of an erotic and marital nature are slowly maturing is obvious. It is my belief that it is no less obvious these institutions, whatever their forms may be, will not mean a surrender to license but will have for their direct object, however obscurely and indirectly, the saving of love and the perpetuation of romantic intimacy and of the ideal of fidelity by those who are capable of this intimacy."

Study Group Department

CÉCILE PILPEL, Director
JOSETTE FRANK, Editor

This study material is presented for the use of interested individuals or groups having the topic of this issue on their regular programs. The study outline is based on the articles. Questions and discussion are taken from study group records.

PARENTS' QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION

A mother who continued her professional career after the birth of her first child has now given up her work in expectation of a second child. She is distressed to find that her boy, now two, seems entirely uninterested in her, resenting her advances and preferring his nurse. What can she do to overcome this?

THERE is no instinct by which a child may distinguish his mother from the person who has cared for him through infancy as a mother-substitute. We have to remember also that so-called "mother love" does not necessarily come of itself, but is a continual growth. Possibly the mother at first resented this child as an interference with her professional interests and ambitions; and if so she must bring herself to an honest acceptance of the child before she can hope that he will accept her. If she truly loves her child, her love will find a natural expression in "doing for him" and the child will soon respond to her affection. Her present increased leisure should make it possible for her gradually to take over some of the physical care of the child as well as to interest herself in his play. Especially must she guard against an absorption in the new infant that is coming. Rather, the new baby may serve to divert much of the nurse's attention, giving the mother more and more opportunity to be with the older child and to take care of him.

Two sisters have always petted and "spoiled" their baby brother. But now that he is growing out of babyhood (he is four) they find his pert ways no longer "cute" and they begin to resent his lack of control and consideration, continually quarrel with him and complain about him to their parents.

DIFFICULTIES of this kind are likely to arise where the family has fallen into the mistake of giving one of its children a false security and over-protection. Where this has happened all of the family members will have to cooperate to alter the situation. The sisters can be helped to see that mistakes have been made, and their interest enlisted in whatever procedures will make for a sounder development for their little brother. They should understand that while "Junior is no longer a baby," to be excused as such, neither can he be expected to grow up all at once, especially since his growing up has been so hampered in the family. They can greatly help him to make a more tenable place for himself in the family constellation.

The little boy himself can be helped to learn the relative rights and responsibilities of the members of the family. He needs contact with other children outside the family's protecting power, so that he may discover for himself that socially acceptable conduct is more rewarding, and rudeness less satisfying than he has been led to expect. He probably needs help, too, in establishing himself as a person capable of some self-help and independence, finding satisfaction in his own successes and achievements.

Living in a small city, a husband and wife, both highly endowed and vivid people, have evolved social attitudes differing somewhat from the accepted community standards. They are distressed, however, to find that their two children, aged ten and twelve, make no friends. The children are devoted to each other and to their parents, but find everyone else "boring" or "stupid" measured by the family yardstick; and they have withdrawn more and more into the security of the family group.

IT often happens that parents who have a standard which others stigmatize as "different" feel called upon to fight in its defense. This fight too often merges into antagonism which finds expression in intolerance of the views of others; and this spirit cannot fail to affect the children's approach to

other children. Family loyalty is interpreted by them as "us against the world." If the parents are sincere in their attitudes they need not feel challenged to defend themselves by belittling others. A tolerant attitude on the part of the parents toward the interests or contributions of others, however these may differ from their own, will leave the children free in their choices, so that they will not feel driven by the need to prove their family and themselves superior.

A father is distressed to find that his children, aged fourteen and sixteen, are more and more finding their recreation away from home. They live in a spacious home well equipped with recreational devices (piano, radio, ping-pong, and so on) yet they rarely invite their friends, preferring public amusements or the homes of their friends.

To be attractive to its growing sons and daughters a home must offer more than space or recreational devices or even affection. Does this home make adequate provision for the developing individuality and personality needs of each of its children? Are they and their friends treated as "people" when they come to visit? Do they find there some place which is, at least for the time, their own—a place in which they may feel free from continual adult surveillance? More important still, are the young people assured of a sympathetic attitude at home toward their choices of friends and amusements? It may be that the children's tastes and interests differ widely from the parental pattern, and they are reluctant to subject their friends to parental criticism, expressed or tacit. Or it may be that the things they find amusing or enjoyable would be considered "unworthy" by the parental criteria. If this is the case, the parents can be ready with suggestions on the constructive side, to help the children to develop for themselves discriminations and standards. But only if the young people can feel really free at home—free of that subtle type of coercion which parents sometimes exert over their children's choices—will they find their home a satisfying place for fun and hospitality.

A girl of seventeen, home from college on her first vacation, has planned several long visits to college friends during the summer. She is an only child, and her parents are hurt that she wishes to be away from them after her long absence.

It is natural for the girl to prefer the companionship of college friends to that of her parents; and this interest does not necessarily bear any relation to her love for her parents. Attempts to coerce her, whether by demands for her presence or by more subtle appeals to filial affection, will be more likely to alienate than to bind her to them. Parents who accept as natural their children's gradual detachment from the home will realize that genuine affectional ties must take the form of sympathy and understanding in a relationship which neither physical separation nor "togetherness" can affect.

In this case it should be possible to find a satisfactory compromise, to arrange the visits in such a way that some part of the vacation will be spent with the parents, either at home or in some place which can be enjoyed together. It might be suggested, also that she invite some of her college friends to visit her, thus shortening the time she will spend away from home.

A mother who is much alone because of her husband's long business trips, expects her eighteen-year-old daughter to stay at home with her many evenings. The daughter is more and more rebelling at these demands, and the mother feels deeply aggrieved at her "lack of consideration."

Consideration must be mutual, for otherwise it becomes merely domination This mother can best teach consideration by being herself considerate, realizing that the whole question is one of balance. What is an eighteen-year-old entitled to in the way of recreation, pleasure, contacts with young people? To what extent may she be asked to forego pleasures without disproportionate sacrifice? What degree of understanding and sympathy may we expect her to have for other people's situations? We may feel, quite rightly, that the practice of consideration, no less than the example, is developing and therefore valid. But we must differentiate between real consideration, willingly given, and the apparent consideration which is merely outward conformity to an enforced demand.

How can family solidarity be maintained where father and mother are obviously not happy together and the children sense this disharmony?

Where the causes of unhappiness are due to an unfortunate combination of personalities and have no sordid or distorted basis, the parents, while they cannot express love, can still treat each other with consideration and respect. Thus the children may see a demonstration of loyalty that is based on mutual respect. As the children grow older the parent who is secure in their confidence

can quite frankly explain the situation to them. Such an explanation, together with some appreciation of the honest effort that is being made for the best good for all concerned, should constitute the strongest possible proof to the children of the validity and need of family loyalty.

STUDY MATERIAL: KEYNOTES OF FAMILY LIVING

Topical Outline*

1. The Importance of the Home for the Child
   - a. Early conditioning and habituation—in relation to health, physical adjustments, routine
   - b. Formation of attitudes—fears, likes and dislikes, standards and ideals
   - c. Attachments and hostilities—toward people, personalities, races
   - d. Family solidarity a source of comfort and security.
2. Relations Within the Family Setting
   - a. Between the parents
   - b. Between parents and children
   - c. Between brothers and sisters
   - d. Between younger and older
   - e. Between grandparents and other family members
   - f. Extra-familial members of household, such as boarders, guests, servants.
3. Special Difficulties and Sources of Danger
   - a. The different demands made upon the home by the father and the mother
   - b. Growing inadequacy of the home as field of activities and joint functioning
   - c. Constant pressure to shift to outside agencies responsibility for care of children
   - d. Opportunity for prolonged dependence—possible results in inferiority feeling; inability to initiate
   - e. Excessive indulgence—arrogance, "selfishness"
   - f. Excessive dominance—revolt against all authority; running away from home
   - g. Fixation of affections—on parent, or other adult.
4. Special Needs
   - a. The child must have opportunity to become himself
   - b. The child must learn to live with many kinds of people
   - c. The child must learn to live in many kinds of relationship—with "superiors" and "inferiors" as well as with equals, without prejudice
   - d. The child must acquire independence of others—freedom from domination and support; freedom from others as objects of domination
   - e. The growing child must have opportunity for insight into the family's economic situation
   - f. The child must have people to respect—his parents if possible
   - g. The child must have faith in people—his home should give him this
   - h. The child must be ready to leave home, but not eager to escape it as something hateful.

Problems for Discussion

1. There are many kinds of friction in family life. How would you distinguish between wholesome and unwholesome friction?

2. In some cities teachers are forced to resign when they marry; in others married teachers are retained but no maternity leave is permitted. Where does justice lie and what would you recommend if you were on a school board?

3. Many parents claim they are entirely impartial in their attitude toward their various children. Is this possible? Is it desirable? How can it be brought about?

4. What is the essential of the home? Is it the household itself or the people that constitute the family, or the activities that center about the household? When we speak of the preservation of the family, what do we mean?

5. Changes in the social and economic structure of the family have resulted in certain advantages and disadvantages. What are these and how may we balance them?

Reference Reading*

American Marriage and Family Relationships
By Ernest Rutherford Groves and William Fielding Ogburn. *Henry Holt & Co.* 497 *pp.* 1928

The Family
By Edward Byron Reuter and Jessie Ridgway Runner. *McGraw-Hill Book Co.* 615 *pp.* 1931

The Family and Its Members
By Anna Garlin Spencer. J. B. Lippincott Co. 322 *pp.* 1923

Family Life Today
Edited by Margaret E. Rich. Houghton Mifflin Co. 244 *pp.* 1928

Home and Family Life in a Changing Community
United States Department of Interior Bulletin Number 5. 1931

Love in the Machine Age
By Floyd Dell. Farrar & Rinehart. 428 *pp.* 1930

Middletown: A Study in Contemporary American Culture
By Robert S. Lynd and Helen Merrell Lynd. *Harcourt, Brace & Co.* 550 *pp.* 1929

The Modern Family
By Ruth Reed. Alfred A. Knopf. 182 *pp.* 1929

The Psycho-Analytic Study of the Family
By J. C. Flügel. International Psycho-Analytical Press. 259 *pp.* 1921

Social Problems of the Family
By Ernest R. Groves. J. B. Lippincott Co. 314 *pp.* 1927

Some Aspects of Education for Home and Family Life
By Lawrence K. Frank. Reprint of an address. *National Council of Parent Education.* 13 *pp.* 1931

*Reprinted from *Outlines of Child Study*, edited by Benjamin C. Gruenberg, The Macmillan Co., 1927.

News and Notes

Schools for Adults Offer Progressive Programs

THE fall announcement of the New School for Social Research presents a varied program of lectures on such aspects of mental hygiene as "An Introduction to the Study of Behavior Problems of Children," "The Mental Hygiene of Everyday Life" and "The Philosophic Aspects of Mental Hygiene." Among the speakers are: George K. Pratt, Frankwood E. Williams, Caroline B. Zachry, David M. Levy, and Joseph Jastrow. A complete program of these and other courses may be obtained on application to the New School for Social Research, 66 West 12th Street, New York.

A course on "Personality Education and Adjustment for Childhood and Youth" will be given under the joint auspices of the New York University School of Education and the Association for Personality Training. Among the speakers announced are: Harvey W. Zorbaugh, Francis J. Brown, Sidonie Matsner Gruenberg, Ira S. Wile, Harry Tiebout, Sarah Ivins, M. J. Exner, C. Elizabeth Goldsmith, Emily T. Burr and Bruce Robinson. Fourteen lectures will be given on Monday afternoons from 4:15 to 6 beginning September 28. Details of registration and fees may be had on application to Harvey W. Zorbaugh, School of Education, New York University, New York City.

The Cooperative School for Student Teachers undertakes its first year's work this fall under the direction of the Central Staff of the Bureau of Educational Experiments. This school offers an entirely new type of training for teachers in progressive schools. Eight cooperating schools will offer their classrooms for the training of the student teachers and the central office will have facilities for lectures and seminars to supplement the actual classroom work. The work will be devoted to practical aspects of early childhood education, program equipment, and teaching techniques for children from the ages of three through seven years. Among those on the Central Staff of the school are Harriet M. Johnson, Lucy Sprague Mitchell, Jessie Stanton, Ellen Steele, and Elsa Ueland. For full particulars apply to the Cooperative School for Student Teachers, 69 Bank Street, New York City.

The Home and the Individual

"THE Role of the Home in Individual and Family Development" was the central theme for the twenty-fourth annual conference of the American Home Economics Association held in Detroit, Michigan, June 22 to 27.

At the general meetings the broader aspects of the topic were developed by authoritative speakers, and the programs of two half-days devoted to special groups made practical application to presentday living of all that is new and sound in home economics and related fields. The atmosphere of the entire conference suggested that only, so to speak, "over the dead bodies" of home economists would family life go into the discard and the sanctity of individual personality be lost.

Flora Thurston, executive secretary of the National Council of Parent Education, in discussing "Opportunities Offered for Parent Education Today", warned the home economics teacher that "in fulfilling her function as a technician, she cannot afford to lose sight of her opportunity as an educator" in which capacity "she pursues the discovery and development of personality," not facts. Moreover, the home economics teacher was shown to occupy an especially strategic position for "interpreting the child to the parent and the home to the school." Mrs. J. K. Pettengill, in behalf of the Parent-Teacher Association, pointed out that although "home economics is but one of the many fields into which parent education is leading countless adults today," the most permanent progress for both causes would of necessity follow, could a program of cooperative activity be adopted (which had been developed) with "child-involving phases of home life" as the dominant note.

Parent Education and Home Economics

As its first attempt to discuss parent education within a special field, the National Council of Parent Education sponsored a conference on "Home Economics Problems in Parent Education" at Detroit on June 20-22, preceding the annual meeting of the American Home Economics Association. Approximately two hun-

dred persons participated, thus demonstrating the keen interest which parent education has generated among home economic teachers and administrators.

The opening discussion, led by Professor E. C. Lindeman, on "Family Relationships," had a threefold purpose — to develop a picture of the most significant cultural changes affecting modern family life; to discover the manner in which these changes affect family relationships; to indicate the meaning of these changes to the teaching of home economics in colleges and high schools. Most of the discussion centered upon the functions which the family appears to be losing—the production of raw materials, recreation, religious training, health education, vocational training, and training in behavior and conduct. Since home economics cannot teach it all, educational coordination is urgently needed.

In the succeeding session on the education of youth for home and family life, Superintendent Gosling emphasized particularly the special function of the public school in relation to youth's training for home and family life. He took as his point of departure Lawrence Frank's statement that "the kind of training which is suitable to make or to convert children into worthwhile adults, whether they are to be married or not, is at the same time the kind of training suitable for preparation for parenthood."

Professor Henry Busch made a ringing social challenge to consider parent education in relation to environmental barriers which tend to confuse and confound the educator and to impede his program. Some of his thought-provoking queries were: Where may the educator find durable and acceptable standards for family life? What responsibility does parent education bear toward the problem of a more adequate distribution of wealth? What constitutes a minimum standard of good housing from the point of view of family life? To what extent is privacy in the home essential, and how may it be incorporated in housing standards? What civic enterprises need to be promoted by parent educators in order to alleviate the unesthetic environment of homes?

After these general discussions the conference considered three practical questions as to how home economics may be of service—to parents in the community; to the individual family; and in planning programs for home economics.

The success of this new venture in conferences was due largely to the ability of home economics leaders to see beyond their specialties and their immediate classroom responsibilities to the social implications of a new era in home economics.

Headquarters Study Groups for 1931-1932

THE Child Study Association continues to recognize the ever-increasing value of study groups as a vital factor in parent education. To that end it presents, under the leadership of staff members and other specialists, a new and carefully integrated program of Headquarters Study Groups for the season of 1931-1932. These are open to all active members upon payment of a registration fee. Members may register on October 20, 21, 22, 23 at Headquarters, 221 West 57th Street, New York City, or by mail. Group meetings begin the week of October 26.

INFANCY

Mrs. Anna W. M. Wolf

Chapter 420—Mondays at 11:00 a. m.

Will include a comprehensive study of the various forces . . . inherited, congenital and environmental . . . which mold the personality of the growing infant.

INFANCY (continuation of 1930-1931 Group)

Dr. Augusta Alpert

Chapter 370—Tuesdays at 11:00 a. m.

Detailed and specific study of the infant from birth to the second year will occupy the attention of this group. This is an advanced group which will build upon the study of last year.

TODDLER (continuation of 1930-1931 Group)

Mrs. Ruth R. Colegrove

Chapter 371—Tuesdays at 11:00 a. m.

The development—physical, intellectual, emotional and social—of the child from two to four years will be considered. Open to Toddler Group of 1930-1931 and to qualified new members.

EARLY CHILDHOOD

Mrs. Anna W. M. Wolf

Chapter 421—Mondays at 2:30 p. m.

Between one and three the child's rapid development as an individual raises questions in the minds of most parents. This group will survey the child's growth and will trace the early processes of learning in relation to later adjustments.

THE PRESCHOOL CHILD

Mrs. Irma W. Hewlett

Chapter 422—Wednesdays at 11:00 a. m.

This group will study the three- to six-year-old

from the point of view of the child's everyday experiences and management in his home. Behavior of children in typical situations will be studied, also the effect upon the child of his treatment by adults.

THE CHILD FROM SIX TO TEN

Mrs. Marion M. Miller

Chapter 423—Wednesdays at 11:00 a. m.

At six the child's widening horizon and his consequent growing independence create new problems of understanding and management. The development of freedom through discipline, and the emotional and social factors that make for a satisfying school experience will be covered.

THE CHILD FROM EIGHT TO TWELVE

Mrs. Cécile Pilpel

Chapter 424—Fridays at 11:00 a. m.

It is important that the parent be aware that normal physical, mental and emotional development of this age comes about gradually, in order that he may understand its significance, and also recognize possible deviations. These factors will be studied by this group.

ADOLESCENCE

Mrs. Sidonie Matsner Gruenberg

Chapter 425—Mondays at 11:00 a. m.

This group will study adolescence in its physiological, psychological and social aspects, the special problems created for the adolescent by modern social and economic conditions, and the constructive role which the parent can play in making this period a normal and fruitful one for the child.

GUIDANCE OF CHILDHOOD AND YOUTH

Miss Margaret J. Quilliard

Chapter 426—Mondays at 2:30 p. m.

An analysis of everyday situations which develop throughout the years of childhood, including early adolescence; the factors inherent in these situations, the principles involved and their constructive applications from the standpoint of wise guidance by the parent or other adult, will be considered.

THE CHANGING SCHOOL

Mrs. Ethel H. Bliss

Chapter 427—Section A—Fridays at 11:00 a. m.
" B—Fridays at 2:30 p. m.
" C—To be announced

The concern of both home and school is with the child. There must be a mutual interpretation and understanding of what is basic in cooperation between home and school. Three sections will study these relationships at different age levels.

THE PARENT'S ROLE IN THE CHILD'S MUSIC EDUCATION

Emanuel Elston

Chapter 428—Fridays at 11:00 a. m.

An entirely new project offers guidance to parents in regard to the musical activities of their children, the testing of music capacity, the evaluation of musical material for use in the home, the observation of method and educational policy in music schools, and the consideration of the place of music in the school curriculum.

GOVERNESSES AND OTHER PARENT SUBSTITUTES

Mrs. Marion M. Miller

Chapter 429—Tuesdays at 10:00 a. m.

This course is planned for women who stand in a professional, quasi-parental relationship to children, as governesses, nurses, mothers' helpers or other mother substitutes. Normal children, their development and their problems will form the basis for discussion.

PARENTS AND SEX EDUCATION

Mrs. Cécile Pilpel

Chapter 430—Wednesdays at 4:00 p. m.

This group will discuss the psychological and socio-psychological aspects of sex education, including the physiology of sex, the important part played by parental experiences and attitudes, and their effect on the attitudes of their children.

COLLEGE COURSES

In cooperation with the Child Study Association the Institute of Education of New York University announces a thirty-hour course on *Problems in the Adjustment of School Children* on Monday evenings, at 7:30 p. m., beginning September 28. Columbia University, University Extension Department of Psychology is also cooperating in a thirty-hour course on *Mental Hygiene: Psychological Factors in Adjustment* on Thursday afternoons, at 4:15, beginning October 1. Both courses, each carrying a two point credit, will be given by Mrs. Marion M. Miller at Headquarters of the Child Study Association. For further information apply to Study Group Secretary at Headquarters.

Announcing

Selected List of Books for Parents and Teachers
Sixth Revised Edition
Published by the Child Study Association of America
221 West 57th Street, N. Y. C., Price 35 cents.

CONFERENCE PERSONALITIES

Ada Hart Arlitt, Ph.D.
Head of Child Care and Training Department, Univ. of Cincinnati.

LeRoy E. Bowman
Extension Work Director, Summer Play Schools Committee, Child Study Association.

Ruth Brickner, M.D.
Psychiatrist, Consultation Service, Child Study Association.

Evelyn E. Eastman
Educational Secretary, United Parents' Associations of Greater New York Schools.

Mrs. Howard S. Gans
President, Child Study Association.

Sadie-Vera Ginsberg
Director, Baltimore District, Child Study Association.

Sidonie M. Gruenberg
Director, Child Study Association; Lecturer on Parent Education, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Eduard C. Lindeman
Professor of Social Philosophy, New York School of Social Work; Consultant, National Council of Parent Education.

Robert S. Lynd, Ph.D.
Professor of Sociology, Columbia University.

Lois Hayden Meek, Ph.D.
Director, Child Development Institute, Teachers College.

Marian B. Nicholson
Temple University, Philadelphia.

Cecile Pilpel
Director of Study Group Department, Child Study Association.

Margaret J. Quilliard
Director of Field Work, Child Study Association.

Elizabeth V. Robinson
Leader under direction of the Joint Committee on Lay Leadership in Parent Education.

Doris Schumaker
Educational Associate, Child Study Association; Acting Professor of Home Economics, Cornell University.

Harry M. Shulman
Research Director, New York State Crime Commission.

Mrs. Fred M. Stein
Chairman, Summer Play Schools Committee, Child Study Association.

Rachel Stutsman, Ph.D.
Psychologist, Merrill-Palmer School, Detroit.

Donald Young, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Sociology, University of Pennsylvania.

Caroline B. Zachry, Ph.D.
Director, Mental Hygiene Institute, State Teachers College, Upper Montclair, New Jersey.

TWO-DAY CONFERENCE
of the
CHILD STUDY ASSOCIATION of AMERICA

October 19-20
1931

New York
N. Y.

HOTEL PENNSYLVANIA
Grand Ballroom

Mrs. Howard S. Gans will preside at all Monday sessions.

Monday, October 19 — Morning Conference 10:00 A. M.

Research in Family Life

Chairman—Eduard C. Lindeman
Speakers—Rachel Stutsman, Caroline B. Zachry, Harry M. Shulman, Ruth Brickner, M.D.

— Afternoon Conference 2:30 P. M.

Social and Economic Changes: Their Effect Upon Man and Woman in the Marriage Relation

Chairman—Donald Young
Speakers—Robert S. Lynd, Sidonie M. Gruenberg
(Other speakers to be announced)

Evening Session to be announced

ASSOCIATION HEADQUARTERS
221 West 57th Street, New York City

Tuesday, October 20 — Morning Conference 10:00 A. M.

Survey of Significant Trends in Parent Education in the United States

Chairman—Cécile Pilpel
Speaker—Lois Hayden Meek
Brief reports of typical programs—
Ada Hart Arlitt, Doris Schumaker, Margaret J. Quilliard, Marian B. Nicholson, Evelyn E. Eastman, Sadie-Vera Ginsberg, Elizabeth V. Robinson

— Afternoon Session 2:30 P. M.

Committee Work as a Project in Parent Education

Chairman—Mrs. Howard S. Gans
Committees of the Child Study Association

—Afternoon Session 4:00 P. M.

Summer Play Schools Committee—Round-Table Discussion

Objectives in Summer Time Activity Programs

Presiding—Mrs. Fred M. Stein
Chairman—LeRoy E. Bowman

Registration: Members, presenting membership cards, $.50
Non-Members, $1.00. Accredited Students, $.50

Family Friction

(*Continued from page 47*)

is jealousy. An outgrowth of insecurity, it may be expressed in many other ways, but most frequently comes to the surface in quarreling or conflict. There is one situation which no family of more than one child can avoid facing—when the first child in the family who has started out as the center of a self-centered world of admiring adults, at two or three is suddenly asked to accept a new baby. He regards him as an interloper whom he finds absorbing most of the adult attention, especially that of the mother. And why should he not be resentful? Tommy who gave one look at his brand new baby sister and shouted, "Take it away!" was simply giving frank expression to a very normal and perhaps unavoidable human reaction.

Of course we all know families in which this critical adjustment whether by luck or by skill has been better managed. In one case a three-year-old girl became unaccountably unmanageable after the birth of her baby brother. Since she also truly loved him, she saved her tantrums for her mother and nurse. Fortunately for the child, who was herself unconscious of the trouble, the parents understood. With patience and love they were able to bring her safely through the difficult experience without concentrating on its outward signs.

Familiar Causes of Conflict

One need not accept without reservation Dr. Alfred Adler's theory of "the family constellation"—in which the oldest, the youngest, the middle children have particular characteristics—to see that the mere matter of the child's age placement is bound to cause a certain amount of wear and tear. The younger child is held up, sometimes unintentionally, to standards that are as yet beyond him. A three-year-old boy who seemed fond of his five-year-old sister suddenly developed an unholy joy in knocking her down. A precocious football tackle around the knees left her perfectly helpless until some grown-up came and removed her from his clutches. And yet there was no doubt he was actually very fond of her. Asked when it began, the parents traced it back to early fall when sister had entered kindergarten. The attention paid by family and friends to her drawings, her little songs, and other new accomplishments which were beyond her brother's three-year-old powers was more than he could tolerate without vigorous, though unconscious, protest. There was just one way he could get the better of her. He *could* knock her down. And he did until a play group for three-year-olds was formed in the neighborhood and he was enrolled. The next time they thought of it, his parents could not recall when last he had resorted to football tactics.

Age placement is just one—and the simplest—of many factors which contribute to the uniqueness of each individual child in the family. Other bases of conflict may be such differences as unequal intellectual equipment, an uneven share in physical strength and good looks, or temperamental conflicts which make incompatibility a real force.

But more important than any of these is the child's relation to his parents. Not only because of its bearing on the question of friction, but still more because of its fundamental significance for personality adjustment as a whole, parents must come to accept each child as *himself*. When any one of them is unsure of his place in the parental scheme of things, brotherly conflict is by that much the more likely to rub the wrong way. The whole complex question of individual differences and the part they play in personality development has been discussed elsewhere.* Unadjusted and misunderstood differences do not always result in open quarreling; but they do mean stress and strain, no matter how deeply buried beneath a calm domestic exterior these may appear to be.

Ruskin in his *Praeterita* describes such an atmosphere of iron serenity which bore heavily on all his childhood and even on his later life. "I never had heard my father's or mother's voice once raised in any question with each other; nor seen an angry, or even slightly hurt or offended glance in the eyes of either. I had never heard a servant scolded; nor even suddenly, passionately, or in any severe manner, blamed. I had never seen a moment's trouble or disorder in any household matter; nor anything whatever done in a hurry, or undone in due time. I had no conception of such a feeling as anxiety . . . . I had nothing to love. My parents were—in a sort—visible powers of nature to me, no more loved than the sun and the moon; only I should have been annoyed and puzzled if either of them had gone out . . . . I had no companions to quarrel with either; nobody to assist, nobody to thank."

There is deep insight in grouping, as he does, the necessity for companions "to quarrel with," "to assist" and "to thank."

The child whose parents are to him "no more loved than the sun and the moon" is not the only one who reflects the emotional state of his elders. The children in the family hold no exclusive claim

**Individual Differences,* pamphlet, published by the Child Study Association.

as generators of friction, either among themselves or between themselves and their parents. Life, literature and the annals of the psychoanalyists alike testify that adult may disagree with adult in endless variation. Though at its worst this may put an intolerable burden on youthful shoulders, at a more constructive level, this looking on at adult adjustments may be a stabilizing balance wheel in the child's own growth toward emotional maturity.

In addition to these more serious conflicts deep rooted within the make-up of the various individual family members, are other factors which frequently contribute to raising family friction to the point of spontaneous combustion. As typical of these we recognize the need for privacy. Even in the large families of earlier generations, there seems usually to have been an attic or an orchard to which sons and daughters could retire on occasion. But what price solitude in a city apartment—or even in most modern homes in comparatively less crowded areas? A girl of sixteen was repeatedly upbraided for taking so long over her bath. Finally she admitted the reason. It was not, as her parents believed, merely stubborn dawdling; the bathtub was the only place where she could be alone.

We are too prone to jump to the conclusion that all friction is to be deprecated, instead of viewing it as a human reaction to one's fellows which may work both ways. What we need is to distinguish destructive and petty quarreling from constructive conflict, and to work for the latter when the former threatens. We all need to let off steam. And where are we more likely to do it than at home where the bars of social convention and business discretion may less disastrously be lowered?

That this is possible the very meaning of the word implies. Friction, by the dictionary, is not only the "act of wearing away or grinding down," but equally the "technique of rounding off rough edges and polishing to bring out the true beauty of the grain."

To achieve this highly desirable result in a figurative, as well as a literal sense, requires insight, sympathy and skill. Every parent will have to develop and adapt his own procedure to fit the needs and temperaments of himself and his family. Somewhere during the process he will learn that it is a mistake to try to stamp out or bottle up irritations by external pressure, and that even members of the same family can learn to express their irritations in ways which are constructive and helpful. Further, he will strive to help each child and adult to build up within himself the kind of self-respect which breeds respect for others.

MACY'S
TOY DEPARTMENT

is now on the Fifth Floor. We have a larger Kindergarten and Nursery Section, with a more complete assortment of delightful playthings for small children.

• Illustrated is a bright colored chest of plain wood blocks in a variety of shapes. It would be a joy to kindergarten age children.

MACY'S

34th Street and Broadway, New York City

Chest of Blocks $3.94

In the Magazines

The Only Child. By D. A. Worcester. Hygeia, August 1931.

The writer challenges the accepted opinion that the only child is at a disadvantage. He contends on the other hand that the only child has "better health" and "better chances," but he fails to consider social aspects in the early years.

Jealous Children. By Cécile Pilpel. Delineator, August 1931.

The terms "jealousy" and "envy" are defined. The author then gives concrete illustrations of behavior manifestations of the so-called jealous child, their possible causes, and how in many instances, with understanding and skill, such behavior could have been avoided.

Home Economics and the Education of the Modern Girl. By V. T. Thayer. Journal of Home Economics, July 1931.

An interesting introduction to this article traces the development of "Home Economics" to the change from the pioneering needs to the needs of an industrial civilization. In conclusion the writer says that the function of home economics will be realized when we are concerned with the larger question of "What is the function of women in contemporary society?" and then proceed to work out how "best to prepare girls for the intelligent exercise of this function."

The Meaning of Mental Health. By Howard Becker. Midmonthly Survey, August 1931.

Defining mental health, its social and individual implications, the writer claims that positive mental health, by means of the development of the best type of personality, is attainable through education, emotional and intellectual, "when the grosser social ills have been successfully combated."

The New Era, August 1931.

"Mechanical Aids to Education" are discussed in this issue. The first article, with the above title, by G. T. Hankin, considers the problem of teacher supremacy versus the use of instruments as power tools. The same issue contains further discussion on co-education in answer to the pros and cons on the subject in the May issue.

The Dangers and Advantages of Sex Instruction for Children. By Karl de Schweinitz. Mental Hygiene, July 1931.

Undue emphasis of factual sex information labelled "education" has diverted the issue from its vital aspects. "Has not the time arrived for the integration of sex instruction for children with the whole movement for child study and parental education?" questions the writer, and he proceeds to emphasize the importance of "the influence upon sex life of the whole atmosphere of the home."

Some Recent Books for Young Children

A sampling of recent books for the younger reader indicates that publishers are responding more than ever to the demands of modern educators and modern children for simple books of fine quality.

To begin with the youngest child, we have *Black Face,* the story of a very curious little lamb who goes adventuring on the cow catcher of a green locomotive. The illustrations are gay and artistic in the modern manner, though they portray prim eighteenth century styles. Here we have beauty and simplicity blended with just enough information for the small person of four to six.

For the slightly older child, just beginning to read, two unusual Indian readers have come from the skilful pen and brush of Therese and Edwin Deming. *Little Eagle* tells of Indian child life through the changing seasons and presents a wealth of information. Step by step the events of each day are recounted with the happy coherence that is based on the authors' profound knowledge and sympathy. This volume is followed by *The Indians in Winter Camp,* addressed to the second grader, and filling a real need in school life. Both of these little books will make excellent supplementary home reading at an age when Indian life and customs are of such vital interest. Each page is made gay with reproductions from water-color sketches by Mr. Deming. These lend charm and interest, and also give a sense

of the vast lands that lie behind the characteristically grouped tribal figures.

The Terrible Nuisance, by Peggy Bacon, should be a joy and delight to the eight-year-old for it tells of things that children do, or *wish* that they could do, in a cheerful small-town setting. The whole has the charm of reality and even when "virtue is its own reward," it is untainted by the tone of the moralist. Both text and illustrations are more mellow than the previous witty and sometimes satiric work of this gifted artist-author.

In *Max,* we have a straightforward story of a little black bear adopted by the pleasant family of a mining engineer. From the finding of the baby cub, through the first year of his mischievous existance, his doings are entertainingly recorded.

Rose Fyleman's new book, *The Dolls' House,* will be heartily welcomed by her many young friends. Here she gives us with characteristic humor and style the romantic adventures of a doll family, appealing to children and adults. The illustrations by Erick Berry have a child-like quality.

Diggers and Builders replies to the "whys" and "hows" of the city child through the pictures and text of Henry B. Lent, who wrote the stories for his own small son. "Tony" the steam shovel man, "Joe" the steel worker and "Bill" the truck driver become real people, and their machines and jobs emerge clearly from the noise and turmoil of modern construction. Many facts are carefully and simply presented here and the volume should rank well with the recent group of excellent informative stories for young children.

MRS. HUGH GRANT STRAUS.

Black Face.
By Thelma H. Bell. Doubleday, Doran & Co. 47 *pp.* $1.50.
Little Eagle.
By Therese O. Deming. Laidlaw Brothers. 96 *pp.* $.90.
The Indians in Winter Camp.
By Therese O. Deming. Laidlaw Bros. 126 *pp.* $1.00.
The Terrible Nuisance.
By Peggy Bacon. Harcourt, Brace & Co. 142 *pp.* $2.50.
Max.
By Mabelle Halleck St. Clair. Harcourt, Brace & Co. 133 *pp.* $2.00.
The Dolls' House.
By Rose Fyleman. Doubleday, Doran & Co. 99 *pp.* $1.50.
Diggers and Builders.
By Henry B. Lent. The Macmillan Co. 68 *pp.* $2.00.

INDUSTRIAL ARTS COOPERATIVE SERVICE
FOR TEACHERS MORE IDEAS FOR CHILDREN MORE OPPORTUNITY
INDUSTRIAL ARTS COOPERATIVE SERVICE

Industrial Arts Cooperative Service
519 West 121st Street, New York City
NON-PROFIT MAKING
Our materials and special parcels provide worthwhile things for boys and girls to do at home.
Send 12c for Illustrated Catalogue

THE NEW SCHOOL
FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH, INC.
66 WEST 12th ST., NEW YORK, N.Y.

THURSDAYS 11 A. M. TO 12:30 P. M.
FEE FOR SERIES $15.00
SINGLE SEATS $1.50
TEL. ALGONQUIN 4-2567

SPECIAL PROBLEMS OF THE SEXES
TWELVE LECTURES BY
OLGA KNOPF

A comparative study of men and women to determine whether there are problems and situations peculiar to each sex.

Oct.	1	Men and women in past cultures
Oct.	8	Men and women in our present culture
Oct.	15	The childhood of boys and girls
Oct.	22	The adolescent boy and the adolescent girl
Oct.	29	Bachelors and unmarried women
Nov.	5	Sexuality
Nov.	12	Marriage
Nov.	19	Husbands and wives
Dec.	3	Fathers and mothers
Dec.	10	The aging man and the aging woman
Dec.	17	Men and women at work
Jan.	7	Do men and women have special problems?

for the modern parent

CHILD PSYCHOLOGY

by

JOHN J. B. MORGAN, Ph.D.

Dr. Morgan's readable book is based on actual work with children in his psychological clinic. His theories are sound; his many suggestions practical. Such difficult child problems as stuttering, negativism, repression, self-determination, coordination, emotional behaviour, fear, punishment, adjustment to his world, are handled sympathetically and with common sense.

Here is a book for the modern parent who realizes that all one's intelligence should be brought to bear on the vital problem of orienting children in the complicated modern world.

Just published. $4.00

Order from your bookseller, or from the publisher.

RICHARD R. SMITH, Inc., 12 E. 41st St., N. Y.

SCHOOL AND HOME

A Magazine published
November, January, March, May
by the
Parents and Teachers Association of the Ethical Culture Schools
33 Central Park West
New York

November Issue:
APPROACHES TO THE SOCIAL STUDIES

Thirty cents a copy — One dollar a year

FRENCH OUT OF DOOR CLUB

14th Season

Selected Group of Girls for daily afternoon Recreation
SUPERVISED PLAY AND SPORTS — KINDERGARTEN WORK
Private Tuition

LILLY GRIMM

288 West 92d Street — Apt. 6-E — Schuyler 4-9347

Central Park Outdoor Group For Boys and Girls

TRAINED LEADERS — ADEQUATE PROVISIONS
SUPERVISED RECREATION — FOR RAINY DAYS

Children called for and returned home by automobile
For further information communicate
CENTRAL PARK OUTDOOR GROUPS
354 Central Park West, between 95th and 96th Sts.
Telephone Riverside 9-0179

Does your child fear the dark?

Does he disturb you with meaningless questions and with that incessant "Why?" Does he alarm you by disobeying? Does he worry you by not telling the truth? Does he show miserly traits? Does he fight with every small boy on the street?

IF you are troubled by these and the other innumerable problems of the growing child, here you will find in a single volume the opinions of experts on every important phase of child development.

GUIDANCE OF CHILDHOOD AND YOUTH

Readings in Child Study

Compiled by the Child Study Association of America
EDITED BY BENJAMIN GRUENBERG

Price $1.50

OUTLINES OF CHILD STUDY

BY BENJAMIN C. GRUENBERG

A companion volume to GUIDANCE OF CHILDHOOD AND YOUTH, that gives detailed and comprehensive guidance toward rational treatment of the child. A manual for parents or anyone concerned with the guidance of young children.

$1.25

MACMILLAN — 60 Fifth Ave. New York, N. Y.

The Editors' Page

IN a century of publication of children's books in the United States, the decade from 1920 to 1930 stands out, not only as the most productive of children's books but as the most widely representative of children's tastes in reading.

FREER communication with children, a better understanding of childhood itself as a recognized state of human existence and an increased respect for the nature and quality of the child mind are responsible for the broader outlook of American parents and educators during the first thirty years of the twentieth century. We have learned as much *from* children as we have *about* them, chiefly, as I think, by following the example of Socrates in going thoughtfully about our daily affairs in our homes, in our schools and in those centers of reading and good citizenship—the children's rooms of our free libraries.

ONLY those who love to read and who keep on reading with discrimination can communicate true love of reading to children. In an era of much weighing and measuring and impressive use of statistics and graphs it is well to pause long enough to take our bearings at the beginning of a new decade. Reading is not so old an art as music, storytelling or painting but like them it continues to be an inexhaustible resource for the refreshment of the spirit. In every age it has resisted methods which fail to reckon with its creative nature and the kindling power of its deeper implications.

WE have only to look back across the years to the didactic period of the eighteenth century to see clearly the futility of substituting the measuring stick of the hour for the divining rod of wonder, beauty, wit and wisdom in books. The approaching centenary of Lewis Carroll's birth recalls that, in a world of changing economic conditions and physical boundaries, Wonderland remains uncharted and childhood undismayed.

Anne Carroll Moore

CHILD STUDY

A JOURNAL OF PARENT
EDUCATION
NOVEMBER 1931
VOL. IX
No. 3

FIFTEEN CENTS THE COPY — ◆ — ONE DOLLAR THE YEAR

CHILDREN'S READING

THE EDITORS' PAGE . . . *Anne Carroll Moore* 65

AN APOLOGY FOR FAIRY TALES . . . . *Fritz Wittels* 67

SHALL WE READ TO OUR CHILDREN? . *Dorothy W. Baruch* 69

ON CHILDREN AND READING . *Sidonie Matsner Gruenberg* 71

READING AS EMOTIONAL EXPERIENCE . . *Floyd Dell* 73

CREATIVE LITERATURE . . . . . *Hughes Mearns* 74

READ THIS! . . . . . *B. J. R. Stolper* 77

STUDY GROUP DEPARTMENT 79

BOOK REVIEWS . . . . . *Josette Frank* 82

WHAT BOOKS FOR CHILDREN? . *Mrs. Hugh Grant Straus* 84

AMONG THE NEW BOOKS FOR CHILDREN 86

NEWS AND NOTES 87

IN THE MAGAZINES 92

CONTRIBUTORS

Anne Carroll More: Supervisor of work with children, New York Public Library.

Fritz Wittels, M.D.: Psychiatrist, Psychoanalyst, Instructor of Psychoanalysis at the New School for Social Research, Author of "Freud and His Time" and others.

Dorothy W. Baruch: Director of the Nursery School, Instructor on Education at Whittier College, Broadoaks Department of Education, Pasadena, Cal.

Sidonie Matsner Gruenberg: Director, Child Study Association of America.

Floyd Dell: Author of "Love in the Machine Age."

Hughes Mearns: Professor of Education and Head of the Department of Creative Education at New York University, author of "Creative Youth," "Creative Power" and others.

B. J. R. Stolper: Teacher of English and Literature in the Lincoln School of Teachers College.

Josette Frank: Member of the Editorial Staff of the Child Study Association of America.

Mrs. Hugh Grant Straus: Chairman of the Children's Book Committee, Child Study Association of America.

The articles in this magazine are copyrighted and must not be reprinted in whole or in part without permission.

THE FORECAST FOR DECEMBER

ARE ALL CHILDREN POTENTIAL ARTISTS?

EDITORIAL
Leo Stein

PAINTING
Peppino Mangravite

MUSIC
Willys P. Kent

DANCING AND RHYTHM
Alys Bentley

DRAMA
Irene Lewisohn

EDITORIAL BOARD

Zilpha Carruthers Franklin
Managing Editor
Josette Frank
Sidonie Matsner Gruenberg
Marion M. Miller
Cécile Pilpel
Cora Flusser
Advertising Manager
Lou MacKibbin
Circulation & Production

CHILD STUDY entered as second class matter March 8, 1926, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Copyright 1931 by Child Study Association of America, Inc., 221 West 57th St., New York, N. Y. Ten months, September through June. Fifteen cents per copy; one dollar a year. Add twenty-five cents for all foreign subscriptions.